IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

TUESDAY, THE 21ST AUGUST 2007 / 30TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 25400 of 2007(W)

PETITIONER:

M.UNNIKRISHNAN, U.D.CLERK,
INSPECTION AND AUDIT, COLLECTORATE,
PALAKKAD.

BY ADV. SMT.S.KARTHIKA
SRI.M.S.UNNIKRISHNAN
SMT.K.P.GEETHA MANI
SRI.M.R.ANISON
SRI.T.R.RAJESH

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY ITS
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
LAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
GOVT.SECRETARIAT, TRIVANDRUM.

2. THE COMMISSIONER OF LAND REVENUE,
LAND REVENUE COMMISSIONERATE,
TRIVANDRUM.

3. THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY, PATTOM,
TRIVANDRUM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. BIJOY CHANDRAN
ADV. SRI. P.C. SASIDHARAN, SC, KPSC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 21/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC,J.

W.P (C) No. 75400 of 2007

Dated this the 21st day of August, 2007

J U D G M E N T

Exhibit-P7 representation was made by the petitioner on 19.3.2006 claiming restoration of his seniority with effect from 23.9.1993. This was declined by the Government and it is challenging Exhibit-P8 that this writ petition has been filed.

2. From the pleadings, it is evident that following Exhibit-P3 order of the Supreme Court, Exhibit-P4 order was issued by the 1st respondent on 30.6.2000 directing that advice be issued to the petitioner but, however, the same will be effective from the date of order. Following this Exhibits P5 and P6 were issued on 5.12.2000 and 29.12.2000 respectively appointing the petitioner as Lower Division Clerk/Village Assistant. Consequent on the condition imposed in Exhibit-P4, similar conditions were also imposed in Exhibits P5 and P6. Accordingly the petitioner's seniority was only from the date of Exhibit-P4.

3. The challenge in this writ petition is confined to Exhibit-P8, but the basic orders, namely, Exhibits P5 and P6 are

not challenged even now and it is obviously due to the delay involved in challenging Exhibits P4, P5 and P6. I find that the claim of the petitioner is highly belated and cannot be allowed to be revived now.

Writ petition, therefore, lacks any merit and it is dismissed.

(ANTONY DOMINIC,JUDGE)

ma

K.THANKAPPAN,J

CRL.A. NO.92 OF 1999

ORDER

25th May, 2007